

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 ROBIN HOLLINS and LOLA HOLLINS,

No. C 16-06740 WHA

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 CORDIS CORPORATION and
14 CONFLUENT MEDICAL
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

15 Defendants.
16 _____/


17 Defendant Cordis Corporation removed this action, “along with other cases asserting the
18 claims of more than 200 plaintiffs, under the ‘mass action’ provision of the Class Action
19 Fairness Act.” Judge Edward Chen issued an order remanding many such cases. Cordis’s
20 appeal from that order raised the same jurisdictional issues that are at issue in the above-
21 captioned matter (Dkt. No. 15 at 2–3). Our court of appeals affirmed Judge Chen’s order on
22 April 14 and denied Cordis’s petition for rehearing en banc on May 23 (Dkt. Nos. 19, 23).

23 Meanwhile, at the parties’ request, the initial case management conference has been
24 postponed, effectively staying the case pending Cordis’s appeal. Now that the appeal has run
25 its course, the Court intends to remand this action next week for the same reasons set forth in
26 Judge Chen’s order and affirmed by our court of appeals unless either side **SHOWS CAUSE** in
27 writing by **JUNE 12 AT 5:00 P.M.** why such remand should not occur. That Cordis may pursue
28 further appeal shall not suffice. This action has now been delayed for approximately three

1 months on account of improper removal. While the Court will at least consider extending the
2 current de facto stay for good cause shown, the mere (and remote) possibility that the Supreme
3 Court might grant review is not good cause for further delay.

4
5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6
7 Dated: June 8, 2017.

8 
9 _____
10 WILLIAM ALSUP
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28